DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 276 004 CS 209 813

AUTHOR Gale, Steven H.
TITLE The ADE Salary Survey: Problems, Procedures, and Results.
PUB DATE Mar 85
NOTE 9p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (36th, Minneapolis, MN, March 21-23, 1985).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College English; Educational Research; *English Departments; Higher Education; Occupational Information; *Professors; *Research Methodology; *Research Problems; Surveys; *Teacher Salaries
IDENTIFIERS *Association of Departments of English

ABSTRACT

This study expands an annual survey conducted by George Worth from 1967 to 1982 for the Association of Departments of English Bulletin of average salaries in 92 English departments listed in the 1970 Roose-Anderson "ACE Rating of Graduate Programs." The present study includes the 106 English departments listed in "An Assessment of Research-Doctorate Programs in the United States: Humanities." The survey instrument was designed to gather the maximum data possible on one page. Based on the survey results, the following recommendations are made: (1) the survey should be continued, (2) the database of 106 institutions should be retained and expanded if possible, (3) research methodology for handling exceptional cases must be clarified, (4) the survey should emphasize the confidentiality of the information given, and (5) a number code for identification should be placed on the surveys for follow-up and correct categorization of information. Conclusions are that the survey was successful and useful for determining salary increases and setting salaries at competitive levels. (A summary paper, "1983-84 Average Salaries in Nationally Rated Graduate English Departments," which presents the survey's results, is appended.) (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED276004

The ADE Salary Survey: Problems, Procedures, and Results

by

Steven H. Gale

A version of this paper was delivered at the Conference on College Composition and Communications at Minneapolis, Minnesota, in March, 1985.

INTRODUCTION

In July, 1981, I attended an Association of Departments of English Summer Seminar at the University of California at Los Angeles. Although I had been a department head for over a year, I knew that there was a great deal of information that I could obtain from those administrators who had considerably more experience than I had. Unfortunately, to my surprize, I found that there was very little information of the sort that I needed available. There seems to be no source that could provide figures on professor's salaries, class loads, class sizes, plus/minus grading, and so forth. Indeed, this information was not even shared by members of institutions within the same system. The department chairs of the nineteen institutions that comprise the California State Unviersity System meet twice annually but they had no established mechanism whereby they could share information about their own departments, and thus they had no idea how their departments compared with other departments within the same system.

I discussed with Phyllis Franklin, the ADE Director, the possibility of conducting a survey to collect some of the information in question. This discussion was continued at the 1982 ADE Summer Seminar at Boise State University. A few months later an alternative was suggested. From 1967 to 1982, Professor George Worth, then Chairman of the Department of English at the University of Kansas (Lawrence), conducted an annual survey of average

CS 209 813

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Steven H. Gale

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

English Department salaries. The results were published in the ADE Bulletin each year. In 1983 Franklin invited me to continue Worth's survey.

PROCEDURES

The data base for Professor Worth's survey was composed of the 92 departments listed in the 1970 Roose-Anderson ACE Rating of Graduate Programs, For the 1983-84 survey I expanded the data base to 106 institutions by including those departments listed in An Assessment of Research-Doctorate Programs in the United States: Humanities, edited by Lyle V. Jones, Garner Lyndzey, and Porter Coggeshall (Washington, DC: National Academic Press, 1982).

INSTRUMENTS

The survey instrument was designed to gather the maximum data in the clearest manner and to do so on one page (a return address was even included on that page in case the return envelop was lost). The format was as follows:

There was a line for the institution's name and spaces to fill in information in three catagories. These included the average 1983-84 nine-month salary by rank (Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor), the median 1983-84 nine-month salary by rank, and the highest 1983-84 nine-month salary by rank. Summer and forth quarter salaries were to be excluded, as were fringe benefits; special cases were to be blended in to averages as individual department heads thought was appropriate to their particular circumstances. I followed Professor Worth's basic design, adding only the high and low categories.

RESULTS

The results of the survey were published in the summer 1984 issue of

the ADE Bulletin, number 78, pp.43-44. The organization was to list by rank the high, and low, average, and median salaries for public and private institutions and all respondants. The figures were further broken down into three catagories from the Roose-Anderson Report--29 institutions with a score in the 3.0-5.0 range, for example. There were also notes included that explained the data base, list in those institutions responding, explaining certain problems that occured in gathering data, and inviting readers to contact me for further information.

DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED

The survey instrument was sent to department administrators on September 29, 1983. I asked that the form be returned as soon as possible and no later than October 20, 1983. This allowed one week in the mail each way and one week for collecting the information requested. The cover letter explained the nature of the survey and how the results were to be recorded. Confidentially was stressed. A stamped, self-addressed return evelope was also included and, as an incentive, departmental administrators were promised that they would receive a summary of the results before they were published. I also indicated that I would try to get those results to the administrators before the Moden Language Association Convention; this was done with the information tailored to fit the Roose-Anderson catagories where applicable, as well as the public/private catagories.

84 of the 106 departments responded, a healthy 79.25%. Computations were done by Missouri Southern's computer center; I had only to divide responses into catagories of public (55) and private (27) institutions. The results from two departments arrived too late to be included in the computations. There were 22 no responses. Of those responding, there were

problems with 18 of the 84 (21.4%). Again, two arrived too late to be useful; three sent revised figures, one did not identify the institution (meaning that there was no way to determine the public/private or Roose-Anderson categories). Fifteen were incomplete: no median figures were provided by three; one department included figures for an endowed chair in their averages but three departments did not include that information in the averages even though they indicated that endowed chaires existed in the departments; cost-of-living increases were not included by two departments (we adjusted the figures supplied to include this); an administrative stipend was included in the figures for one department but not for another; no figures were given by one institution for full professor, by one institution for associate professor, and by two institutions for assistant professor (these were not the same institutions, naturally); one institution stated that figures for tenure track positions could be requested only from the dean; one university provided only average salary figures for the entire institution rather than for the department. In addition, two departments provided information based on other than nine-month salaries-- one was based on a 12-month salary and one on an 8-month salary. We did not convert the figures. Ironically, there was also a converse problem of too much information being provided. Two departments gave more than one figure for a given catagory.

Additional problems were encountered in the area of institutional support. Postage, telephone costs, papger, envelopes, duplicating, and student help amounted to approximately $80. There was also computer time involved. The ADE had supplied mailing labels for the survey and some of these were out of date. I received several letters from irate chairpersons

who were upset at my having addressed the survey to their predessors. finally, there was data supplied that fit in none of the catagories requested.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The survey should be continued.

2. Professor Worth's 1983-83 survey gathered information from 50 of 64 departments surveyed, a 78.125% response rate. The expansion of the data base did not diminish the percentage of responses; there was a slight improvement, in fact. The data base of 106 institutions should be retained. Probably it would be useful to expand even more. There are no two-year colleges and only one four-year college represented, even though this type of higher education institution constitutes the largest number of level in America, and the data collected may be of only limited use to them since it is determined on the basis of information from research institutions.

3. There is a need to clarify how to deal with exceptions.

4. There is a need to clarify or emphasize the confidentiality concept. Some department heads appartnetly feared that the information would be made public with their names attached, and some did not realize that confidentiality would be observed and that therefore they could not obtain information about other institutions.

5. A number code for identification should be placed on the survey instruments for follow up and for placing the information in the correct catggories. If precoded, the information could automatically be dealt with rather than having to be catagorized as individual returns are received, as we had to do this time.

CONCLUSIONS

CONCLUSIONS

The survey was successful and valuable. There were comments of appreciation in letter form, and I have received approximately one dozen telephone calls from departmental administrators requesting further information. There have also been a number of queries regarding when the next year's survey will be undertaken.

The information gathered is useful in requesting salary increases from administrations because of the hard evidence available. There is also value in the information provided for setting salaries at various levels, and for the individual instructor who can receive some idea of what is considered a competative salary. The minor problems that were encountered have been more than offset by these values and may be avoidable.

The ADE had recently conducted a wide-ranging survey of randomly selected English departments. The salary information was not included, but plans are for this information to be requested in the future so, although the procedures involved may vary, the information will be available in future years.

1983–84 AVERAGE SALARIES IN NATIONALLY RATED GRADUATE ENGLISH DEPARTMENTS

Steven H. Gale

IN THE past the data base for the annual ADE survey of average salaries in nationally rated English departments consisted of the 92 departments in the 1970 Roose-Anderson ACE *Rating of Graduate Programs*.[1] This year the survey was sent to the 106 departments listed in *An Assessment of Research-Doctorate Programs in the United States: Humanities*, edited by Lyle V. Jones, Gardner Lindzey, and Porter E. Coggeshall (Washington, D.C.: National Academic, 1982).[2]

In late September 1983 I sent the instrument to the chief administrators of those departments, requesting that they send me the high, low, average, and median salary figures by rank for their faculty members for the 1983–84 academic year (summer and fourth-quarter salaries excluded). The figures were to include only salaries, not total compensation (i.e., not salary plus fringe benefits). Of the 106 departments surveyed 84 responded, a healthy 79.25%.[3]

From 1967 to 1982, George Worth, Chair of the Department of English, University of Kansas, Lawrence, conducted the annual ADE survey of average salaries in English departments. The author of the present survey is Professor of English and former Head of the Department of English at Missouri Southern College.

Results[4]

Professor	Public (55)	Private (27)	All Respondents
High	$72,000	$70,000	$72,000
Low	23,850	27,119	23,850
Average	37,757	43,736	39,774
Median	34,992	42,500	37,400
Associate Professor			
High	45,700	40,500	45,700
Low	16,827	19,800	16,827
Average	26,810	29,258	27,616
Median	26,312	28,200	26,918
Assistant Professor			
High	31,740	30,300	31,740
Low	17,419	15,900	15,900
Average	21,093	22,929	21,705
Median	20,800	23,000	21,175

The figures for the 29 institutions with a Roose-Anderson score in the 3.0–5.0 range were:

	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
High	$68,500	$39,600	$29,400
Low	27,333	20,835	17,600
Average	44,283	28,529	22,822
Median	42,525	28,026	22,800

The figures for the 13 institutions with a Roose-Anderson score in the 2.5–2.9 range were:

	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
High	$63,553	38,897	31,740
Low	24,905	16,827	19,152
Average	39,395	28,536	21,948
Median	38,932	27,300	21,605

The figures for the 22 institutions with a Roose-Anderson score in the 2.0–2.4 range were:

	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
High	$72,000	40,500	30,300
Low	24,425	20,490	17,700
Average	38,032	26,973	21,305
Median	34,500	26,665	20,780

NOTES

[1]The Roose-Anderson ACE *Rating of Graduate Programs* presents the results of a survey that established the top 92 English department graduate programs. Primarily on the basis of recommendations from 130 graduate deans, 285 questionnaires were sent out; 239 were returned. Institutions representing 2% or more of the doctorates produced in the ten-year period 1957–67 received four questionnaires (one for the department chair, two for senior scholars, and one for a junior scholar); institutions that produced .5–1.9% of the doctorates during the same period received three questionnaires (one each for the chair, a senior scholar, and a junior scholar); and institutions that produced 0–.49% received two questionnaires (one for a senior scholar and one for a junior scholar). Those surveyed were asked to place "Leading Institutions, by Rated Quality of Graduate Faculty" into one of seven categories: "Distinguished" (3.0–5.0 on a scale of 1–5), "Strong" (2.5–2.9), "Good" (2.0–2.4), "Adequate," "Marginal," "Not Sufficient Doctoral Training," and "Insufficient Information." Results were published only for those institutions falling in the top three categories.

[2]The primary criterion for inclusion of an English program in *An Assessment of Research-Doctorate Programs in the United States: Humanities* was that the university had awarded at least 13 doctorates during FY1976–78. Of the 198 faculty members participating in the evaluation (62% of those asked to respond to the survey), 180 were nominated by their institutions, and 18 were selected by some other process. There were 105 professors, 75 associate professors, and 18 assistant professors. Sixty-eight percent had received their highest degree before 1970. In the survey, graduate programs and faculty received a mean rating (on a scale of 0–5 or 0–3), but no attempt was made to place institutions within specifically delineated categories.

[3]American Univ.; Univ. of Arizona; Univ. of Arkansas; Auburn Univ.; Ball State Univ.; Boston Coll.; Boston Univ.; Bowling Green State Univ.; Brandeis Univ.; Brown Univ.; Univ. of California, Berkeley; Univ. of California, Davis; Univ. of California, Los Angeles; Univ. of California, Riverside; Univ. of California, San Diego; Univ. of California, Santa Barbara; Case Western Reserve Univ.; Univ. of Chicago; Claremont Graduate School; Univ. of Colorado; Columbia Univ.; Univ. of Connecticut; Cornell Univ.; Univ. of Delaware; Duke Univ.; Univ. of Florida; Fordham Univ.; Univ. of Georgia; Harvard Univ.; Univ. of Illinois; Indiana Univ., Bloomington; Univ. of Kansas; Kansas State Univ.; Kent State Univ.; Univ. of Kentucky; Lehigh Univ.; Louisiana State Univ. and A&M Coll., Baton Rouge; Univ. of Maryland; Univ. of Michigan; Michigan State Univ.; Univ. of Minnesota; Univ. of Mississippi; Univ. of Missouri; Univ. of Nebraska; Univ. of New Mexico; New York Univ.; Univ. of North Carolina; Univ. of North Dakota; Northern Illinois Univ.; Northwestern Univ.; Univ. of Notre Dame; Ohio State Univ.; Univ. of Oklahoma; Oklahoma State Univ.; Univ. of Oregon; Univ. of Pennsylvania; Pennsylvania State Univ.; Univ. of Pittsburgh; Princeton Univ.; Rice Univ.; Rutgers Univ.; State Univ. of New York, Binghamton; State Univ. of New York, Stony Brook; Univ. of South Carolina; Univ. of Southern California; Southern Illinois Univ.; Stanford Univ.; Syracuse Univ.; Temple Univ.; Univ. of Tennessee; Univ. of Texas, Austin; Texas A&M Univ.; Texas Tech Univ.; Tufts Univ.; Tulane Univ.; Univ. of Utah; Vanderbilt Univ.; Univ. of Virginia; Washington Univ. (Mo.); Univ. of Washington; Washington State Univ.; Wayne State Univ.; Univ. of Wisconsin, Milwaukee; Yale Univ.

[4]The responses from two universities arrived too late to be incorporated, one respondent included no identification and thus the figures provided could not be included in certain categories (public/private, the Roose-Anderson rankings), and policy at two universities prevented the respondents from supplying all the information requested. In several other cases the data were incomplete. That is, not all institutions responded in all categories. Finally, at some institutions special cases were averaged in with the figures presented, while at others the data were noted separately. I averaged in the figures for emeritus faculty or the administrative stipends provided for department heads and chairpersons or deans.

[5]Readers interested in a breakdown of the number of responses may write to the author.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE